

REMARKS

Claims 63-101 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In an Office Action dated December 15, 2009, claims 63-101 were rejected. Claims 63-64, 78, 86, 95-96 and 99 are amended, claims 28-62 are canceled, and claims 63-101 remain pending upon entry of this amendment.

Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 63-77 and 96-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner asserts that independent claims 63 and 96 include communicative coupling between the content indexing module and the multimedia server. According to the Examiner, such coupling is not disclosed in the specification. Without agreeing or disagreeing with the Examiner, the Applicants have amended the claims to expedite the prosecution of the claims. The Applicants submit that the amended claims do not include the objected language and therefore request the Examiner to withdraw the written description rejection as applied to the amended claims.

Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 63, 65 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori, et al. (US 4,703,366) in view of Reese, et al. (US 7,298,512). Claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori in view of Reese as applied to claim 65 above, and further in view of Hymel (US 2003/0220988). Claim 68 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori and Reese as applied to claim 63

above, and further in view of Morinaga (US 4,734,898). Claim 69 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori and Reese as applied to claim 63 above, and further in view of Katsuo, et al. (US 5,721,883). Claims 70, 71 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori and Reese as applied to claim 63 above, and further in view of Krumm (US 6,611,622). Claims 73-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori, Reese & Krumm as applied to claim 72 above, and further in view of Chino (US 6,118,888). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as applied to the amended claims.

Claim 63, as amended, partly recites:

the embedded multimedia server within the printer for selecting a portion of the monitored streaming media content based on a plurality of user defined criteria ... the plurality of user defined criteria comprising segmented clips from the monitored media content wherein the segmented clips include one or more speakers speaking in the segmented clips;
...
an output module communicatively coupled to the embedded multimedia server for constructing a storable representation for the selected portion of the streaming media content;
...
a print engine within the printer for generating a printout of ... [the] storage representation.

As explained in the pending application, a printer receives time based media content from an input source. The printer comprises an embedded multimedia server, an output module and a print engine in addition to other modules not mentioned here. The embedded multimedia server selects parts of the received time based media content based on user defined criteria comprising “segmented clips from the monitored media content wherein the segmented clips include one or more speakers speaking in the segmented clips.” The output module constructs a storable representation of the parts selected by the multimedia server and

the print engine generates a printout of the storage representation. Accordingly, the printer beneficially allows the user to specify the criteria for the desired parts of the media content and later pick up the printouts (on paper or on another storage medium) of the desired parts. The user need not get bogged down with intermediate steps like content analysis, storing the results of the analysis, transmitting the results to the printer and then printing the results.

Kobori, Krumm and Reese do not disclose “the embedded multimedia server within the printer for selecting a portion of the monitored streaming media content based on a plurality of user defined criteria ... comprising segmented clips from the monitored media content wherein the segmented clips include one or more speakers speaking in the segmented clips.”

Kobori discloses a video image printer for capturing and printing an image from an input video stream in response to receiving a freeze signal. Kobori, Fig. 2, 3: 21-30, 4:29-5:2. Upon receiving a freeze signal, a recording command generating section sets the recording command signal to “H” level and a frame from the input stream is captured. Kobori, 4:43-4:54. After the complete frame has been captured, the recording command signal is set to “L” level and the captured framed is retained by the printer for printing.

Kobori does not disclose capturing a frame based on a user defined criteria comprising selecting “segmented clips from the monitored media content wherein the segmented clips include one or more speakers speaking in the segmented clips.” Kobori instead receives a freeze signal for capturing the frame and the freeze signal does not include criteria comprising clips when one or more speakers are speaking. Because the freeze signal in Kobori does not specify criteria comprising segmenting clips that include one or more speaking speakers, Kobori does not disclose the above mentioned element.

Krumm does not remedy the deficiencies of Kobori. Krum discloses “an object recognition system that identifies people and objects in an image of a scene.” Krumm, abstract. Krumm computes and compares the histograms of people and object to be identified with histograms of various parts of the image. If the histogram match, Krumm designates the image part associated with the histogram as the matched person or the object. Krumm, abstract. Krumm does not disclose analyzing the histograms or another analysis technique to determine parts of an image where a person is speaking. Accordingly Krumm does not disclose identifying a part of the image based on a user defined criteria comprising selecting “segmented clips from the monitored media content wherein the segmented clips include one or more speakers speaking in the segmented clips.”

Chino does not remedy the deficiency of Krumm and Kobori. Chino discloses a multi-modal apparatus that interacts with a user. Chino, abstract. The multi-modal apparatus tracks the user’s gaze and receives user input in various forms like audio instructions. Chino, 6:30-35. The audio instructions are processed by Chino and converted into text for further processing. 7: 11-13. Chino does not disclose selecting “segmented clips from the monitored media content wherein the segmented clips include one or more speakers speaking in the segmented clips.” Neither the speech recognition module nor other modules in Chino select segments of a media clip that include speaking users. Accordingly, Chino does not disclose above mention element.

Additionally, Reese, Hymel, Morinaga and Katsuo do not disclose the above mentioned element of claim 63 and the Examiner does not allege that they do.

In sum, Kobori, Krumm, Chino, Reese, Hymel, Morinaga and Katsuo whether considered alone or combined, do not disclose the elements of claim 63. Therefore, a person

of ordinary skill in the art considering the teachings of the references would not find the claimed invention obvious. Independent claims 78 and 96 are not obvious for at least the same reasons. The dependent claims 64-77, 79-95 and 97-101 incorporate the elements of their base claims 63, 78 or 96 and are also not obvious for at least the same reasons.

Moreover, in rejecting claim 75, the Examiner cites Step A12 for disclosing identifying a voice of one or more speakers in a recorded meeting. However, Chino at step A12 does not disclose identifying voice of one or more speakers. Chino at Step A12 instead discloses searching control rules for a specific output decision to obtain and execute the control processing for the output decision. Chino does not identify one or more speakers in a recorded meeting because Chino does not solve the problem of identifying speakers in a meeting. Chino instead provides a simulated person that interacts with a user based on the user's gaze and user's audio instructions. Because Chino provides a simulated interface to interact with a user and Chino does not solve the problem of identifying people in a meeting, Chino at step A 12 or in other parts of the reference does not disclose identifying a voice of one or more speakers in a recorded meeting.

Allowance of all claims is requested. If the Examiner believes that direct contact with the Applicants' attorney will advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned as indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
JONATHAN J. HULL, ET AL.

Dated: February 15, 2010

/Greg T. Sueoka/

Greg T. Sueoka, Reg. No. 33,800
Attorney for Applicants
Patent Law Works LLP
165 South Main Street, 2nd Floor
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Tel: (801) 258-9821
Fax: (801) 258-0160
Email: gsueoka@patentlawworks.net

20412/08351/DOCS/2194992.2